Prevention of food adulteration act

2753. SHRIMATI S.G. INDIRA: Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state:

(a) whether at present, mineral water/packaged drinking water does not come within the purview of the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954 as water has been specially omitted from defintion of food;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor; and

(c) whether any action is being taken to amend the said Act?

THE MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ): (a) to (c) Quality standards/specifications for Mineral Water and Packaged Drinking Water are already laid down undertheitem nos. A. 32 and A. 33 of the Appendix-B of the Prevention of Food Adulteration Rules, 1955.

Mineral Water and Packaged Drinking Water are different from the ordinary water that is excluded from the purview of the Preventioii of Food Adulteration Act, 1954.

Population growth

2754. SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state:

(a) w. iether it is a fact that the population growth rate is on the decline;

(b) if so. the details thereof;

(c) Whether it is also a fact that population experts have warned that down in population growth brings with it immense challenges and responsibilities for Governmant; and

(d) if so, the details thereof and how Government propose to meet these challenges and responsibilities?

THE MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ): (a) and (b) The statement showing India's and State-wise Average Annual Exponential Growth Rate from 1961-71 to 1991-2001 is enclosed (Seebelow).

(c) and (d) Information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

Average Annual Exponential Growth Rate

Sl. No.	State/UT	Annual Exponential Growth Rate (%)			
		1961-1971	1971-1981	1981-1991	1991-2001
1	2	3	4	5	6
	INDIA	2.22	2.20	2.14	1.93
I.	MAJOR STATES				
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1.90	2.08	2.17	1.30
2.	Assam	3.00	2.10	2.17	1.73
3.	Bihar	1.90	2.16	2.10	2.50
4.	Chattisgarh	2.40	1.86	2.29	1.66
5.	Gujarat	2.58	2.44	1.92	2.03
6.	Haryana	2.79	2.53	2.42	2.47
7.	Jharkhand	2.04	2.13	2.15	2.09
8.	Karnataka	2.17	2.37	1.92	1.59
9.	Kerala	2.33	1.76	1.34	0.90
10,	Madhya Pradesh	2.57	2.40	2.41	2.18
11.	Maharashtra	2.43	2.19	2.29	2.04
12.	Orissa	2.24	1.84	1.83	1.48
13.	Punjab	1.96	2.14	1.89	1.80
14.	Rajasthan	2.46	2.85	2.50	2.49
15.	Tamil Nadu	2.01	1.61	1.43	1.06
16.	Uttar Pradesh	1.78	2.26	2.28	2.30
17.	West Bengal	2.38	2.08	2.21	1.64
II.	SMALLER STATES				
1.	Arunachal Pradesh	3.29	3.01	3.14	2.33
2.	Delhi	4.25	4.25	4.15	3.81
3.	Goa	2.98	2.37	1.49	1.39

(1) (2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
4. Himachal Pradesh	2.07	2.13	1.89	1.62
5. J&K	2.60	2.60	2.65	2.55
6. Manipur	3.19	2.81	2.57	2.63
7. Meghalaya	2.74	2.78	2.84	2.62
8. Mizoram	2.23	3.96	3.34	2.56
9. Nagaland	3.36	4.06	4.45	4.97
10. Sikkim	2.58	4.11	2.51	2.85
11. Tripura	3.10	2.77	2.95	1.46
12. Uttaranchal	2.18	2.43	2.17	1.76
III. UNION TERRITORIES				
1. A&N Island	5.94	4.94	3.97	2.39
2. Chandigarh	7.64	5.63	3.52	3.39
3. D & N Haveli	2.47	3.35	2.89	4.65
4. Daman & Diu	5.36	2.32	2.52	4.42
5. Lakshadweep	2.77	2.35	2.51	1.59
6. Pondicherry	2.45	2.48	2.90	1.87

Source—Provisional Population Totals, Paper—1 of 2001 Census of India 2001 and State Profile 1991 India, Census of India 1991.

Rape case at AIIMS

†2755. SHRI MOTILAL VORA: Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that a woman patient was gang raped in June, 2003, in the All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi:

† Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.